

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review the Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's comments, including the Office Action mailed June 26, 2007. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Summary of rejections and amendments

The Examiner previously rejected claims 1-3, 9, 12, 14, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Applicant has amended claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 21 and canceled claims 1-3, 9, 12, 14, 17 and 20. Claims 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 are therefore pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 9, 12, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stagg (GB 2200817 A). The Applicant points out that all of these claims except claim 19 have been canceled, so the rejection is moot as to those claims. As to claim 19, the Applicant notes that claim 19 depends from claim 18, which was indicated by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter. Because claim 19 depends from and contains all the limitations of claim 18, claim 19 is believed to be allowable as well.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stagg in view of Fukusawa (US 5,642,387). Claim 2 has been canceled, so this rejection is believed to be moot.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stagg in view of Kang et al. Fukusawa (US 6,748,497). Claim 3 has been canceled, so this rejection is believed to be moot.

Allowable subject matter

The Examiner states that claims 4-8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of the base and intervening claims. The Applicant has amended claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 21 so that they are in independent form and include all the limitations of the base and intervening claims. These claims are therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 5, 6, 8, 11, 16 and 19, which depend from these allowable claims, are also believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

The Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims pending in the application. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

If any extensions of time are necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. If any fees are inadvertently omitted, or if any additional fees are required, or if any amounts have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3085 of the Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Berrier
Reg. No. 35,066

Dated: 9/26/07

Law Offices of Mark L. Berrier
3811 Bee Caves Road, Suite 204
Austin, Texas 78746
telephone: 512.306.9200
facsimile: 512.306.9952
mberrier@texasIP.com